

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,881	02/11/2004	Theodore L. Parker	P091	6430
7590 04/05/2007 BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 1404	•		BUI, VY Q ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, VA	A 22313-1404			
	3			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATÉ	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	04/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		i	he			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	2.0			
	10/777,881	PARKER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Vy Q. Bui	3734				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mi , cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status .	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 O	ctober 2004.	·				
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		atters, prosecution as to the	e merits is			
.—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-50</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) . Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attach	ed Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/4/2004.	6) Other: _					

Art Unit: 3734

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

At least claims 1, 6, 7, 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over at least claims 51, 54, 56, 60 of copending Application No. 11/325,223. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims include a method of dispensing a beneficial agent into an expandable medical device/stent for reducing restenosis with the same main feature of the invention such as dispensing a palitaxel into a body of a stent/prosthesis.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 3734

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vy Q. Bui whose telephone number is 571-272-4692. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hayes can be reached on 571-272-4959. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vy Q. Bui

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3734

03/29/09